

10/576,457 Response to Office Action of September 15, 2009 Page 5 of 6

REMARKS

I. Status of the claims

Claims 1, 9, and 11 are amended in this response. Claim 16 is new. Claims 10 and 13 are canceled. Claims 2-8, 12, 14 and 15 were previously amended. By entering this amendment, claims 1-9, 11, 12, and 14-16 remain for reconsideration.

II. Response to Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-9 and 11-15

The Examiner has continued to reject claims 1-9 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over EP 0 663 418 B1 (Yoshino et al.) in combination with U.S. Pat. No. 5,931,997 (Babler) and U.S. Pat. No. 5,056,426 (Warych) and made the rejection final.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's telephone conversation with their attorney, Shao-Hua Guo, on November 13, 2009 and his willingness to discuss and enter the amendments of claims 1, 9, and 11.

As discussed with the Examiner, Applicants, in this response, have amended claims 1, 9, and 11 by changing the amount of phthalocyanine pigment from " 10^{-4} to 1 %" to " 5×10^{-3} to 5×10^{-2} %" in each of the respective claims. The amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure. See page 3, lines 37.

Since Babler teaches the use of phthalocyanine pigment only as a coloring agent and in such use the amount of phthalocyanine pigment (preferred amount from 0.1 to 10%) is significantly greater than Applicants' claimed range of 5×10^{-3} to 5×10^{-2} %. Thus the combination of Yoshino et al., Babler, and Warych cannot make claims 1, 9, and 11 and their dependent claims obvious because, *inter alia*, Babler is moot in view of the claim amendments.

Applicants have also added new claim 16 which further defines the glass fibers in claim 3 by their length and diameter. Claim 16 finds support from page

NOV 16 2009

PAGE 8/8 : RCVD AT 11/16/2009 10:33:49 AM [Eastern Standard Time] : SVR:USPTO-EFAXF-5/6 : DNIS:2738300 : CSID:16103592414 : DURATION (mm-ss):01-22

10/576,457 Response to Office Action of September 15, 2009 Page 6 of 6

3, lines 4-10 of the specification. It should be allowable because it depends from claim 3.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner enter the claim amendments, reconsider and withdraw the rejection. Applicants invite the Examiner to telephone their attorney, Shao-Hua Guo, at (610) 359-2455 if a discussion of the application might be helpful.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Mecklenburg et al.

By: Shao-Hua Guo
Shao-Hua Guo
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,728
LyondellBasell Industries
Phone: (610) 359-2455
November 16, 2009

Customer Number: 24114